

Remarks

Responsive to the Office Action mailed January 28, 2005, Applicants submit the following remarks. Re-examination and favorable reconsideration are respectively requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4 of Applicants application under 35 USC 102, arguing that the '767 patent to Roberts discloses all the features of these claims. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The Examiner indicated that Roberts '767 discloses a second discharge velocity of at least 1.4 times greater than the first discharge velocity. However, Roberts '767 discloses velocity gradients over its respective air curtains PC, SC and TC. Accordingly, the velocity associated with (1) the PC air curtain range from 200 to 250 fpm from back face to front face, (2) the SC air curtain range from 250 to 300 fpm from back face to front face, and (3) the TC air curtain is 300 fpm. Accordingly the ratio any two such air curtains is not "at least" 1.4. For example the ratio of the back face of SC to front face of PC is 1:1, less than 1.4. Similarly the ratio of the TC air curtain to the front face of the SC air curtain is 1:1. Accordingly, Roberts '767 does not disclose velocity ration of at least 1.4 as claimed and claim 1 therefore is submitted to be in condition for allowance. Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1 and accordingly, based on the same arguments presented above, are also submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Please charge any required fees to Deposit Account 03-0835.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone or personal interview can facilitate resolution of any matters in this case, Applicant's attorney may be contacted by telephone at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Abbas Alahyari

By: 

Bryan Rockwell

Attorney for Applicant

Reg. No. 36,656

Tel. (860) 674-3014

Fax: (860) 998-2483